

VZCZCXRO6642

OO RUEHBZ RUEHDBU RUEH DU RUEHFL RUEHKW RUEHLA RUEHMR RUEHNP RUEHPA  
RUEHRN RUEHROV RUEHSL RUEHSR RUEHTRO  
DE RUCNDT #0685/01 1951101  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
O 141101Z JUL 09  
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6918  
INFO RUEHZO/AFRICAN UNION COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE  
RUEHZL/EUROPEAN POLITICAL COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE  
RUEHGG/UN SECURITY COUNCIL COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 USUN NEW YORK 000685

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR AF, IO, PM, USUN/W

E.O. 12958: DECL: 07/13/2019

TAGS: [PREL](#) [PGOV](#) [PTER](#) [PHUM](#) [MARR](#) [MOPS](#) [KPKO](#) [UNSC](#) [SO](#) [ER](#)

SUBJECT: ACTION REQUEST: IDENTIFYING OPTIONS FOR RESPONDING  
TO ERITREAN ACTIONS IN SOMALIA AND DJIBOUTI

REF: USUN 679

Classified By: Ambassador Rosemary DiCarlo, for reasons 1.4 (b)  
and (d)

¶1. (U) This is an action request, please see paragraph 5  
below.

¶2. (SBU) Following the Security Council's debate on  
Somalia July 9, Council members are now considering whether  
to move forward on the question of sanctioning Eritrea for  
undermining the Djibouti Peace Process. The Council adopted  
a Presidential Statement on Thursday that expresses intent to  
"consider expeditiously" action against parties working to  
undermine peace and reconciliation in Somalia, while taking  
note of the African Union's recent communique issued at the  
Summit in Sirte calling on the Security Council to impose  
sanctions on Eritrea for providing support to armed groups  
engaged in destabilizing activities in Somalia.

¶3. (C) At the PR and DPR level, France and the UK have  
stated their desire to consider seriously imposing sanctions  
on Eritrea for its actions in Somalia and stressed their  
desire to forge a common position with the US. The Mission  
attended expert-level consultations with France and the  
United Kingdom July 10 to discuss possible ways of moving  
forward on sanctions if we decide to pursue this option. Also  
discussed was our response to a Djibouti-drafted resolution  
circulated to the P3 on July 9 that proposes sanctioning  
Eritrea for the illegal occupation of Djibouti and its  
refusal to accept mediation efforts. Neither France nor the  
UK was supportive of the Djibouti-drafted resolution as a  
stand-alone document, believing that Djibouti must be  
addressed in conjunction with Somalia. Based on our  
discussions, we identified two possible courses of action on  
sanctions, one incremental, the other immediate and  
comprehensive:

Option One, Incremental Approach: This approach would use the  
existing UNSCR 1844 framework (the November 2008 document  
that established a targeted sanctions on those who undermined  
stability in Somalia, violated the Somalia arms embargo or  
impeded the delivery of humanitarian assistance) to sanction  
Eritrean individuals and entities for their activities in  
Somalia. The Committee received the Monitoring Group's first  
tranche of possible names for designation last week and we  
expect the second tranche shortly. The first tranche includes  
only names and entities specific to Somalia, including  
al-Shabaab and the Somali Islamic Front. (NOTE: The  
Monitoring Group will circulate the expected Eritrean names  
despite Eritrea's July 13 decision to cancel the group's  
planned visit to the country. END NOTE.). This approach  
would not allow us to sanction individuals or entities for  
their actions in Djibouti, but we could address Djibouti's  
grievances through a political statement.

Option Two, Comprehensive Approach: Craft a new sanctions resolution that would levy sanctions on the Eritrean government for actions in both Somalia and Djibouti. This approach would maintain the existing Somalia Sanctions Committee, while creating a SC-imposed framework of sanctioning the Eritrean government directly for transgressions in both Somalia and Djibouti.

¶4. Pointing to the African Union Peace and Security Council's (AUPSC) communiqu , the UK expressed a strong desire to move forward with sanctions on Eritrea for actions in Somalia, either via UNSCR 1844 or a new sanctions resolution, stating that, "the door on negotiations with Eritrea is now closed." France agreed with the two possible routes for sanctions, although pressed for inclusion of language on Djibouti. France and the United Kingdom would like to forge a consolidated position with us that we can then present to both Uganda, as current President of the Security Council, as well as separately to the Djibouti Permanent Representative.

¶4. (C) Although the P3 has not formally approached other members of the Security Council with the two options, recent informal conversations have shed light on possible positions. Uganda favors basing new sanctions on the names that will be submitted to the Somalia Sanctions Committee by the Monitoring Group and believes that other African Council members would not be in favor of a new sanctions regime related to the Djibouti border dispute. Russia is also expected to support the designation of Eritrean individuals and entities by the Committee, whereas China is expected to be less supportive of these designations, yet unlikely to

USUN NEW Y 00000685 002 OF 002

block action.

¶5. (SBU) Action Request: USUN requests instructions from the Department on the U.S. position, calling attention to the options described in paragraph two and noting the AUPSC's call for the SC to impose new sanctions.  
RICE